

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #03
CONTRACT NUMBER: 012026-1009
RFP/RFQ TITLE: HR Learning Management System
CONTACT: Shawn Seaks
EMAIL: procurement@portoftacoma.com
PHONE NUMBER: 253-888-4744
QUESTIONS DUE DATE: 3/12/2026 @ 2:00 PM (PDT)
Q&A ISSUE DATE: 3/13/26

#	Question	Answer	Question #
1	Would you be amenable to using vendor paperwork for the provision of the services as a contractual foundation?	No. The Port's contractual paperwork takes precedence over the vendors. We will not accept vendors paperwork for the provision of services.	3649
2	Will there be an opportunity for the respective Legal teams to negotiate the agreement terms, in good faith, at the shortlist or vendor selection stage?	No. Agreement terms are to be negotiated during the question period per the RFP.	3649
3	1. Is the vendor supposed to fill and submit: ATTACHMENT B – PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT TEMPLATE & TERMS AND CONDITIONS?	no to attachment B but yes to the following: ATTACHMENT C – COST BREAKDOWN-OFFER TEMPLATE ATTACHMENT D – VENDOR CYBERSECURITY SELF-ASSESSMENT ATTACHMENT E – PORT LMS REQUIREMENTS	3652
4	2. Which one is the currently used LMS and what's the reason for a switch (if an LMS is currently in use)?	The Port of Tacoma does not currently have a Learning Management System in place. This RFP represents the Port's first formal LMS procurement.	3652
5	3. Is there any specific eligibility criteria?	The Port of Tacoma does not have specific eligibility criteria for this RFP. All qualified vendor are encouraged to respond.	3652
6	4. What use case(s) does the Port of Tacoma wish to fulfill using an LMS?	The Port of Tacoma seeks an LMS to support four primary use cases: employee onboarding, compliance training, safety training, and skills development. The solution must support self-paced learning and include HR standard compliance training and technical courses. Where the native platform does not offer these course types, the solution must support integration with third-party content libraries to fill those gaps.	3652
7	5. What all user roles would be needed within the LMS (for example: Admin, Learner, Instructor, Creator)?	The Port of Tacoma requires the following user roles: Admin, Learner, and Creator. Admin access will be needed by those responsible for uploading and managing course content, as well as HR staff overseeing the platform. The Creator role will support those building and developing course content, and the Learner role will serve all employees accessing training.	3652
8	6. Is there a scope of expansion beyond 325 users?	Yes. As the Port of Tacoma continues to hire, new employees will require access to the LMS. The selected solution should be able to accommodate user growth over time.	3652
9	Cost breakdown sheet is supposed to be filled in the same format as given or can the vendor submit their own compensation model?	Please submit cost breakdown as same format as given in the RFP	3669
10	For the pre-built HR training courses like safety, sexual harassment, and more, is there a provision of these courses being outsourced and integrate within the vendor's LMS?	The expectation is if we need to link to an external training program, such as FEMA Emergency Management Training or original content, we can assign and track completion through the vendor LMS to our existing users. We will only provide training to our employees. We would like the ability to also track training that occurs in-person or outside of the system, like CPR and First Aid certifications.	3669

11	Apart from the internal employees, are there any external learners whom Port would wish to allow the access to content?	No, training is only for our employees and elected officials. There may be training new hires must take before they begin their first day of employment.	3669
12	What is the current L&D structure given there has been no use of an LMS before?	There has been a combination of external trainers brought in, custom training delivered by staff, and safety external vendor training. We have also utilized licenses for LinkedIn and Viva Learning which we will discontinue. Departments seek their own training from time to time.	3669
13	Is there any anticipated budget of the project?	We prefer not to disclose a total project budget. Based on our CHRO's prior agency experience and preliminary market research, we anticipate that annual LMS subscription costs for <350 users vary greatly but may fall within the range of approximately \$15,000-\$85,000 depending on LMS functionality, scale, and service levels. We have also budgeted for implementation services. We encourage vendors to propose their most competitive and value-driven solutions aligned with our requirements.	3669
14	Is the Port currently using an existing Learning Management System? If so, could the Port please identify the current platform and whether this procurement is intended to replace it?	The Port does not currently use a dedicated LMS. Training is managed through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers. This procurement establishes a new capability rather than replacing an existing system.	3675
15	If the Port is transitioning from an existing LMS or manual training management process, could the Port please share the primary challenges or limitations it hopes to address with the new LMS solution?	The Port seeks to centralize training management, improve compliance tracking and visibility, and support scalable delivery of required and developmental training across Port and NWSA employees. The Port currently leverages LinkedIn Learning for technical training and seeks an LMS that can integrate with or complement that existing investment.	3675
16	Does the Port currently maintain internally developed training courses that will need to be migrated into the new LMS?	Yes. The Port maintains internally developed training materials that will need to be available within the new LMS. Please see question #14	3675
17	If existing training content is available, could the Port indicate the approximate number of courses and the formats in which they exist, such as SCORM packages, video modules, PowerPoint, PDF, or other formats?	Existing content in SharePoint numbers 122 and is mostly in MP4 format with a few in word or pdf. There aren't many HR trainings (< 5) but once we have a LMS, we may create more and host outside vendor training in the system too, maybe NEOGOV user training. I can also see us wanting to add timekeeping training once we upgrade or change ADP. Our existing training will be Teams recordings and PPT, PDF's, and video modules.	3675
18	Does the Port currently maintain any SCORM-compliant or other packaged eLearning modules that will need to be imported into the new LMS?	No	3675
19	The requirements matrix references Port of Tacoma and Northwest Seaport Alliance (NWSA) as separate groups within NEOGOV. Should the LMS support separate organizational structures, training assignments, reporting, and administration for these entities?	Ideally yes, we can have two separate organizational structures. Alternatively, we can set up POT and NWSA divisions – it really depends on the system capability. The primary concern is the need to differentiate work groups for reporting, tracking, etc.	3675
20	Will the LMS be expected to integrate directly with NEOGOV for automated user provisioning, or will the Port provide periodic user data exports for synchronization with the LMS?	The Port prefers direct integration with NEOGOV for automated user provisioning but does not require it. Vendors should describe their existing integration capability or approach. Data exports are acceptable as an alternative	3675
21	The requirements matrix references training catalog categories including leadership development, technical training including Microsoft technologies, HR compliance, safety, workplace conduct, employee rights, and soft skills. Does the Port anticipate that the LMS vendor will provide access to a third-party training content catalog, or will the Port source training content independently?	The Port expects vendors to offer access to a third-party content library. Priority categories include Microsoft technologies, leadership development, HR compliance, safety, and soft skills. The LMS must also support internally developed content.	3675
22	Does the Port have a preferred implementation timeline or target go-live timeframe following contract award?	The Port is targeting go-live by End of 2026. Vendor proposals should include a full implementation schedule covering configuration, migration, integration, UAT, and training.	3675

23	Does the Port have a preferred pricing structure for the LMS solution, such as per-user licensing, enterprise licensing, or tiered pricing based on user counts, and is there a target annual investment range the Port anticipates for this initiative?	The Port is open to per-user, enterprise, or tiered pricing models. Vendors should present pricing with clear assumptions. Total cost of ownership over three years will factor into evaluation.	3675
24	For pricing purposes, should vendors assume that the LMS will initially serve approximately 325 users only, or should pricing also account for potential expansion to additional Port-related entities such as NWSA or other eligible agencies?	325 encompasses everyone – do not anticipate much growth in the next 3 years, certainly not above 340	3675
25	Will the LMS be expected to support Single Sign-On integration with the Port's identity management system, such as Microsoft Entra ID / Azure Active Directory or another authentication provider?	Yes. The Port uses Microsoft Entra ID and requires SSO support.	3675
26	Are there any specific security certifications or compliance standards, such as SOC 2, ISO 27001, or other applicable frameworks, that the Port requires the LMS vendor to maintain?	We use the NIST CSF 2.0 as a framework to implement and audit our cyber security program. We would ask for the SOC2 Type 2 report, and if they have an ISO2007 certificate that would be good to see. If they provide shareable supporting documentation to accompany the ISO27001 cert, we will want to review that as well (shareable under NDA infosec policy, vulnerability management, and vulnerability scan data)	3675
27	Can you please describe the desired integrations for Microsoft Teams and Sharepoint?	The Port of Tacoma utilizes Microsoft Teams as its primary communication and collaboration platform and SharePoint as its intranet and document management system. Integration with Teams and SharePoint is preferred, as outlined in the requirements matrix. Vendors should indicate whether their platform supports these integrations and describes the capabilities available, such as launching training from within Teams, delivering notifications through Teams, or referencing content stored in SharePoint.	3679
28	Can you please describe the types and amounts of data that need to be included in migration?	The Port does not currently use a dedicated LMS. Training has been managed through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers. Data migration will primarily involve internally developed training materials currently available as Teams recordings, PowerPoint files, and PDFs, as well as any applicable records from third-party content providers. A full data inventory will be provided to the selected vendor during Phase 1 planning.	3679
29	What specific limitations or frustrations with your current learning approach prompted this RFP? Are there workflows or processes that feel overly manual or disconnected?	The Port currently manages training through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers, with no dedicated LMS in place. Primary limitations include the lack of centralized compliance tracking and reporting, limited visibility into training completion across Port and NWSA employees, and an inability to scale delivery of required and developmental training efficiently. This procurement establishes a new capability rather than replacing an existing system.	3682
30	What are the most complex compliance training requirements you manage? (e.g., TWIC credentialing, safety certifications, maritime-specific training) How are these currently tracked and reported?	Government specific to include public records act, open public meetings, etc. Compliance training to include: Department of Transportation Reasonable Suspicion Training for Supervisors, ADA Interactive Process. Currently training is either delivered via outside resources or developed and delivered internally.	3682
31	Which departments or stakeholder groups will be the heaviest users of the LMS? Are there specific use cases or workflows that vary significantly between departments (e.g., compliance training for operations vs. leadership development for management)?	All employees will use the LMS. Depending on system content and capabilities, the heaviest users will be Information Technology, Maintenance, Operations, and Supervisors and Managers.	3682

32	Section C mentions 'Support system integrations' in Phase 3. Which systems are critical for Phase 1 integration vs. nice-to-have for future phases? Specifically, are there requirements for HRIS/payroll systems (e.g., ADP, Workday), Azure AD/Entra ID for SSO, badging/access systems, performance management, SharePoint for content, or financial systems?	Phase 1 critical integrations: Azure AD/Entra ID for SSO (mandatory) and SharePoint for content access. Integration with NEOGOV for automated user provisioning is preferred but not required — vendors should describe their existing capability or propose a data export alternative. Integration with LinkedIn Learning is also preferred, as the Port currently leverages it for technical training and expects the LMS to integrate with or complement that investment. Nice-to-have for future phases (NOT IN THIS SCOPE OF WORK): HRIS/payroll system integration (ADP), badging/access systems, and performance management platforms.	3682
33	Evaluation Criterion #2 (Content Catalog/Library, 35 points) asks for training across six focus areas including 'Technical knowledge and ability with a focus on Microsoft offerings' and 'Safety.' Beyond online courses, what other learning formats need to be supported? (e.g., instructor-led training, virtual instructor-led, on-the-job training tracking, mentorship programs, external certifications)	All examples given are desired	3682
34	Section C, Phase 3 mentions 'Data migration activities.' What is the volume and complexity of historical training data that needs to be migrated? Are there specific compliance or audit requirements for maintaining historical records (e.g., TWIC certifications, safety training records)?	The Port does not have a legacy LMS. Existing training records are maintained through SharePoint and third-party platforms. Migration will involve internally developed content in formats including Teams recordings, PowerPoint, and PDFs	3682
35	Section A (Purpose) mentions the Interlocal Cooperation Act (RCW 39.34) allows other public agencies to leverage Port contracts. How frequently do other agencies typically leverage Port contracts? Should the solution be architected to support multi-tenant use by other public agencies, or will this be a Port-exclusive deployment? If so, Do the two entities need separate branding, separate reporting, separate admin controls, or is everything shared?	Not very frequently. Courses are shared. The branding logos for each organization is different. Reporting capabilities must be able to report as a whole and drill down by organization.	3682
36	What is the approximate volume of in-house/custom content that already exists at the Port, and in what formats? (e.g., SCORM packages, video files, documents, PowerPoint presentations, PDFs)	The Port maintains internally developed training content in formats including Teams recordings, PowerPoint presentations, and PDFs. There are currently fewer than five HR-developed training courses. Additional content is anticipated post-implementation, including potential hosting of third-party vendor training such as NEOGOV user training and future timekeeping training. A full content inventory will be provided during discovery.	3682
37	Is there an existing content authoring tool currently in use (e.g., Articulate Storyline, Rise, Camtasia, Captivate), or does the Port need the LMS vendor to provide authoring capabilities?	The Port does not currently use a standardized content authoring tool. Vendors are asked to indicate whether authoring capability is included in their platform, available as an add-on, or whether integration with third-party tools such as Articulate or Camtasia is supported.	3682
38	What LMS or training tracking system (if any) is currently in use at the Port? The RFP says data migration is 'as applicable' in Phase 3 and Section D, which suggests there may or may not be a legacy system.	The Port does not currently use a dedicated LMS. Training is managed through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers including LinkedIn Learning. This procurement establishes a new capability rather than replacing an existing system.	3682
39	If a legacy LMS or training tracking system exists, what specific data needs to migrate to the new platform? (e.g., user records/profiles, completion history/transcripts, certificates, course content/SCORM packages, historical compliance records)	There is no legacy LMS. Migration scope will be determined during discovery and will focus on internally developed content currently stored in SharePoint, along with applicable compliance and completion records. Vendors should not assume a clean-slate implementation with no historical data.	3682
40	Are training records currently tracked in a centralized system, or are they managed through spreadsheets, SharePoint lists, or other decentralized methods?	The Port does not currently use a dedicated LMS. Training is managed through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers including LinkedIn Learning. This procurement establishes a new capability rather than replacing an existing system.	3682
41	Is Single Sign-On (SSO) via Azure AD/Entra ID a mandatory requirement for the LMS, or is it preferred but not required?	As indicated in the requirements matrix - SSO via Microsoft Entra ID is a mandatory requirement for Phase 1 go-live.	3682

42	For Phase 5 (Ongoing Support), is there an expected number of support hours per month or quarter, or is the expectation purely on-call/as-needed support?	The Port's expectation for Phase 5 support is primarily on-call and as-needed rather than a defined monthly commitment. Vendors should propose their standard support tiers and SLAs, including response time guarantees for critical issues, and identify any ongoing managed services options available post-go-live.	3682
43	The RFP targets contract execution for May 13, 2026. Is there a specific target go-live date for the LMS, or is that to be determined during the implementation planning phase?	The Port is targeting go-live by End of 2026. Vendor proposals should include a full implementation schedule covering configuration, migration, integration, UAT, and training.	3682
44	Regarding the requirement in 2. Content Catalog/ Library "To include the ability to curate custom in-house training" Is the Port interested in the ability to add their own custom content to the LMS?	Yes. The ability to upload, organize, and deliver internally created training content is a requirement. The Port expects to maintain and grow its library of custom content alongside any vendor-provided course catalog. The LMS must support both.	3680
45	The RFP document says the cost proposal must reflect standard market pricing for 325 users (pg. 2) and mentions 300 users in another place (pg. 3). Can the Port please specify the correct number and also include the breakdown of their employee count (Full-time, Part-time, and Seasonal employees)?	325 encompasses everyone – do not anticipate much growth in the next 3 years, certainly not above 340. (See Q24 for additional context)	3683
46	What is the proposed contract length?	The Port anticipates an initial contract term of three (3-5) years, beginning from the effective date following contract execution (anticipated May 13, 2026). This covers the full implementation, go-live, and three years of ongoing support, maintenance, and platform usage. The three-year term allows the Port to: (1) Complete full implementation (Phases 1-4) during the contract term, (2) Operate the LMS with full vendor support for three years post-launch, (3) Assess long-term platform value, vendor partnership quality, and organizational learning maturity. After three years, the contract may be renewed, extended, or terminated based on performance and mutual agreement. Vendors should propose pricing that includes implementation services (Phases 1-4) plus three - five years of annual platform licensing and ongoing support. Break out implementation costs separately from annual licensing costs so the Port can see the full cost of ownership. The Port is committed to a multi-year partnership with the selected vendor.	3683
47	What information needs to be integrated both imports/exports? Would this need to be an API or SFTP transfer?	Integration requirements will be finalized during Phase 1 Discovery. In your proposal, describe your platform's standard integration capabilities and how you approach custom integrations, including timeline and cost implications.	3683
48	Do you conduct training for any learners that aren't employees? If so, how many external learners?	No, training is only for our employees and elected officials. There may be training new hires must take before they begin their first day of employment. (See Q11)	3683
49	Where/How are you currently conducting training for employees? (Third Party vendor, existing courses, etc.) Do you have a need for importing historical training records and if so how many?	The Port does not currently use a dedicated LMS. Training is managed through an internal SharePoint site and third-party content providers (including LinkedIn Learning). Existing content in SharePoint numbers 122 items, mostly in MP4 format with some Word or PDF files. Data migration will focus on internally developed content stored in SharePoint along with applicable compliance and completion records. (See Q17, Q28, Q34, Q38, Q39, Q40)	3683
50	Do you have a need for importing historical certifications & licenses? Will you need this ongoing from external sources?	The Port does not currently track historical certifications in a centralized system. Migration scope will be determined during discovery. Currently training is either delivered via outside resources or developed and delivered internally. (See Q30 and Q34)	3683

51	We would like to confirm that references will not be required until the final stage, meaning references would only be required once a firm is in the final evaluation phase?	Correct. References will not be required until the final evaluation stage. The Port will request references only from vendors who advance to the final stage (shortlisted firms). References will be contacted at that time to discuss implementation experience, support responsiveness, and client satisfaction.	3683
52	How would the Port like us to submit all aspects of the proposal? Would the Port like the functional requirements excel matrix and Cybersecurity questionnaires submitted as separate documents apart from the RFP or would the Port like them as an appendix in the compiled RFP Response? If separate documents are required, is each document allowed to be up to 9mb or do they have to be a maximum of 9MB combined?	Please submit all aspects of the proposal as a PDF. Functional requirements excel matrix and Cybersecurity questionnaires needed to be submitted as separate documents. Each document that is uploaded can be a max of 9mb	3683
53	Can we use our own pricing format in addition to Attachment C? Additionally, if the response documents need to be attached separately (see Question 8), would that also include Attachment C? If not, would Attachment C be part of the proposal or in the appendix.	Attachment C (Cost Breakdown-Offer Template) must be completed in the specified format provided in the RFP. This standardized template ensures consistent pricing comparison across all vendors. You may include supplementary pricing documentation (executive summary, three-year projections, ROI analysis) as an appendix following the completed Attachment C. See Q3 for required attachments and their format requirements.	3683
54	The Personal Services Contract Template, Section 6 references that any custom code created by the Consultant shall be owned by the Port. Depending upon the solution, a Port license for exclusive use as opposed to ownership of IP may be more appropriate. Would the Port be willing to consider such a modification to the language to accommodate more flexibility?	The Port's standard position is that any custom code, configurations, or intellectual property developed specifically for the Port under this contract shall be owned by the Port. However, the Port recognizes that depending on the solution and vendor business model, alternative IP arrangements may be appropriate. Vendor-owned product code (core LMS platform, libraries, standard features) remains the vendor's intellectual property. Third-party integrations (LinkedIn Learning API, Microsoft integrations, NEOGOV connectors) are governed by respective vendor terms. The Port is willing to consider alternative IP ownership or licensing models during Phase 1 Discovery and detailed contract negotiation if they do not compromise the Port's ability to maintain, modify, or transition the system post-contract. Vendors should propose their preferred position on custom code ownership in their technical proposal. Negotiate specific terms during Phase 1 Discovery post-vendor selection.	3691
55	Section A. Purpose of the RFP states: The successful respondent may be precluded from competing for, or participating in, subsequent contracts that are the direct result of or primarily generated by, the work performed under the contract resulting from this procurement. Please clarify this statement, assuring that proposers are eligible to bid for future work not related to this LMS RFP.	Yes proposers are eligible to bid for future work not related to the LMS RFP	3691
56	Since the Port does not currently have an LMS in place, does Phase 1 Discovery include evaluating and recommending a specific LMS platform, or should proposers assume the platform is selected through the RFP and Discovery focuses on tailoring the chosen solution to Port needs?	The LMS platform is selected through the RFP evaluation process. Phase 1 Discovery focuses on implementation planning and comprehensive tailoring of your platform to Port-specific needs, not on evaluating alternative platforms. See Q22 for Phase 1 timeline and scope, and Q32 for Phase 1 critical integrations and requirements.	3691
57	Should the LMS support separate administration and reporting for Port of Tacoma and NWSA, or will a single unified environment with organizational filtering be sufficient?	Ideally yes, we can have two separate organizational structures. Alternatively, POT and NWSA can be set up as divisions depending on system capability. Courses are shared between entities. Branding logos for each organization are different. Reporting capabilities must be able to report as a whole and drill down by organization. (See Q19, Q35)	3691

58	Beyond the LMS content catalog, does the Port of Tacoma anticipate needing custom course development for Port of Tacoma-specific topics such as operational procedures or internal policies? Is there a pre-existing catalog or documents that we should integrate? Would instructor-led or blended training options be valued?	Yes, the Port will develop custom training content for Port-specific policies and compliance topics. The LMS must support all learning formats: online, instructor-led, virtual instructor-led, on-the-job training, mentorship, external certification tracking, and simulations. The platform must include authoring tools or integrate with third-party tools (Articulate, Camtasia, etc.) so HR staff and training administrators can develop and maintain content independently. Vendors may propose optional custom development services as separately-priced add-ons, but these are not required for Phase 1.	3691
59	For the integrations listed as preferred (NEOGOV, KnowBe4, SharePoint, Teams), should proposals assume automated data exchange such as user provisioning and completion syncing, or is the initial scope limited to SSO and manual workflows?	<p>Single Sign-On (SSO) via Microsoft Entra ID/Azure AD is the only mandatory integration requirement at Phase 1 go-live (End of 2026). Users must authenticate via Port AD credentials.</p> <p>All other integrations are preferred but not required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NEOGOV user provisioning and completion syncing (preferred) - SharePoint content access and sync (preferred) - Microsoft Teams integration (preferred) - LinkedIn Learning integration (preferred) <p>If you offer any of these integrations, they must be bidirectional where applicable (data flows both directions, not one-way). Describe in your proposal which integrations are available natively, which require third-party middleware or custom development, and any associated costs or timeline impacts. The Port will prioritize integration build-out post-launch based on operational needs and available budget.</p>	3691
60	Should platform evaluation criteria account for future capabilities such as AI-personalized learning paths, an AI learning companion, VR/AR safety/maintenance training, and simulation-based assessments, even if these are not part of the initial deployment?	Phase 1 evaluation criteria focus on core LMS functionality and go-live readiness by End of 2026. AI-personalized learning paths, AI learning companions, VR/AR training, and advanced simulations are not required for Phase 1 evaluation. Vendors are welcome to include a brief roadmap (1-2 pages) highlighting future capability support for these features as a tie-breaker or differentiator, but do not assume budget or timeline for these capabilities in Phase 1 proposals. See Q22 for Phase 1 timeline and Q33 for required Phase 1 learning formats.	3691
61	Please confirm that external links that direct reviewers to sample training content from our organization's catalog are permitted to be included as part of Item 2: Content Catalog/Library.	Yes. External links that direct reviewers to sample training content from your organization's catalog are permitted as part of Item 2: Content Catalog/Library. (See Q21)	3691
62	Are section dividers, if utilized, excluded from the overall page limit?	No	3691